EFFECTS OF STUDENTS' ENGAGEMENT ON WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON WRITING QUALITY

Chen Lili, Daron Benjamin Loo, Helen Tajoda

ABSTRACT

This quasi-experimental study sought to determine whether students' engagement with written corrective feedback had an impact on their writing quality. In an intact freshman English composition course, students were introduced to two types of feedback, which were direct feedback and metalinguistic feedback. These two feedback types were chosen due to the positive results seen in past studies. Having familiarized themselves with these types of feedback, students chose which feedback they preferred. There was a total of three groups: two treatment groups that received direct and metalinguistic feedback, while the third group, a control group, received no feedback. The focus of the feedback was on the English article system, and students' use of English articles was examined over three drafts. Descriptive statistics was used, and there was no significant difference among the three groups. Nonetheless, there appeared to be a general trend of improvement when analyzing individual progress. This finding may be indicative of how engagement with feedback is inherently different among individual learners.

KEYWORDS: Written corrective feedback, Engagement

p40-54 Chen Lili.indd 40 2/8/2560 BE 14:16

INTRODUCTION

After the controversial claims made by Truscott (1996) regarding the effectiveness of written corrective feedback (WCF), many scholars initiated studies aimed to justify the need and value of WCF. To date, many studies concur that feedback, especially those provided in a systematic manner, was quite beneficial, on top of being expected by students and other educational stakeholders (Sheen, Wright, & Maldowa, 2009; Bitchener & Knoch, 2010a, b; Sheen, 2010). What these studies claim is a positive result on students' writing proficiency as a result of engagement with WCF. Nonetheless, as seen in most of these studies, writing teachers are responsible for the provision of feedback, which includes the determination of the type of feedback, and approach for which feedback is provided. Other variables such as learning context and beliefs have yet to be included in the pedagogical processes of WCF. Hence, to critically examine the value of feedback, this study aims to explore the value of students' belief on useful WCF, and how these beliefs affect writing quality.

Position of Written Corrective Feedback

Truscott (1996), in his paper questioning the value of written corrective feedback (WCF), argued that there is no empirical evidence to justify the provision of WCF. Nevertheless, studies have repeatedly shown the necessity of providing WCF. For one, students rely on feedback as a means to know their strengths and weaknesses in their writing (Leki, 1991; Paulus, 1999; Grami, 2005). Feedback is also expected of the teacher, as it shapes and guides learning strategies employed by students in their writing tasks (Hyland, 2003). It must be noted though, that feedback does not only need to come from teachers. Peers and outside sources may be useful sources for feedback as well. In some contexts, these types of feedback were found to be more effective than feedback provided by teachers (Biber, Nekrasova, & Horn, 2011).

Students' Engagement with Corrective Feedback

When teaching writing, Hyland (2003) cautioned that the provision of feedback needs to be considered in light of students' individualities. Studies on language learners have reiterated the notion that learners possess individual learning purposes, styles, interest and resources. All of which are pertinent to the formation of pedagogy (Ehrman, Leaver & Oxford, 2003). When the teaching of writing, or any other language skills, is contextualized to the cultural setting and individualities present in the classroom, a positive disposition in the form of agency and autonomy may emerge. Aside from making feedback relevant to the students, it needs to parallel the domain of treatment that each form or writing aspect belongs to. With this in the foreground, the likelihood of uptake of correct forms or expressions of meaning would increase (Ferris, 2004).

In pedagogies that value students' beliefs, students may engage well with their teachers' teaching approaches, which would subsequently facilitate the learning process. When students are involved in this process, the teaching procedures are assumed to be within the students' zone of proximal development (ZPD), as there is a manipulation of material that students are familiar with, whilst introducing novel ones. In writing, this may be provided through understandable and

p40-54 Chen Lili.indd 41 2/8/2560 BE 14:16

explicit prompts (Nassaji & Swain, 2000). When WCF is clearly understood, students would be able to manage their output in a more controlled manner (Hartshorn et al., 2010). For instance, in the study by Ferris, Sinha, and Senna (2013), the provision of WCF was perceived by the subjects as appropriate because it highlighted specific error patterns and allowed clarification and explanation of errors and correct forms. The study also found that students were more confident with their writing by the end of the course. This was also seen in Yang and Kim's (2011) study, where students' beliefs of what works or what does not work was accounted for by their teacher, which led to a positive remediation of students' writing. In a similar vein, subjects in Hyland's (2003) study reported that they believed that receiving frequent feedback would help them improve, and without feedback they would not know what their problems or issues are (Hyland, 2003). What these studies show us is how students' beliefs have an influence over the learning process, especially for L2 learners (Barcelos, 2003). Hence, for a successful uptake of feedback, or of any learning, students' beliefs regarding pedagogical approaches need to be weighed to ensure that learning is maximized. These types of engagement may be compared to Jang, Reeve, and Deci's (2010) framework of objective and subjective engagement. While the former is concerned with students' visible behaviors such as performance in class, the latter is students' intrinsic values which, if positive, would encourage students to be more intentional, invested, critical, and optimistic towards their learning.

Nonetheless, as is expected in language learning classrooms, not all pedagogical initiatives yield positive results. There are many factors which may lead students to becoming disengaged from their learning context. Ferris et al. (2013) highlighted several factors which may impact writing students' writing progress. For instance, students may lack self-editing strategies. Typically, self-editing strategies are based on what 'sounds right', which learners acquire after ample exposure to the target language. Unfortunately, many L2 writers have yet to develop this intuitive strategy, compelling them to rely on feedback from their teachers. This is seen in Ferris' (1995) study, where the L2 writers were found to take read and re-read their drafts more frequently to make sense of their teacher's feedback. Another factor which may affect the writing quality of students is prior grammar instruction. In most cases, students who had received focused-form instruction were found to more aware of grammar and structure in their writing. The nature of the writing task may also be an influential factor. For example, the length of the assignment may affect the number of errors committed. Aside from the length, the duration of which the task was completed may also affect writing quality. When given limited time, subjects would not be able to apply what they had formally learned or informally acquired. Student attitudes also play an important factor – where the value that students place on their writing tasks influences how they write.

Effective Written Corrective Feedback

The previous section highlighted how students become engaged with WCF, as well as factors which may affect students' engagement. In this section, effective and engaging WCF found in other studies are explained. When evaluating the effectiveness of feedback, studies typically

p40-54 Chen Lili.indd 42 2/8/2560 BE 14:16

examine the quality of students' writing tasks. Studies which have demonstrated an effective execution of feedback provision, though varied in settings, share similarities. First, these studies provided feedback in a systematic manner. A systematic provision of feedback may be characterized by the deliberate action of a teacher in focusing on a particular grammatical or content form. For example, studies conducted by Sheen, Wright, and Maldowa (2009), Bitchener and Knoch (2010a; b), and Sheen (2010) showed that students who received focused and direct feedback showed greater gains in grammatical accuracy, even in delayed post-tests. In certain cases, improvement was also experienced in other forms and structures which were not addressed through feedback (Sheen, Wright, & Moldawa, 2009). The unsystematic provision of feedback, often seen in unfocused corrective feedback, may be unmanageable and eventually lead to a breakdown in learning. Hartshorn et al. (2010) suggested that frequency and meaningfulness are not the only variables to be considered when providing feedback, but the cognitive load expected from students to successfully manage WCF. Another type of feedback which has been found useful is metalinguistic feedback (MF), which is more encompassing as it highlights different aspects of writing such as grammar, structure, and content.

One other aspect worth considering is the mode in which the feedback is provided. Studies have looked at the systematic oral provision of feedback, and have found that its effects may be differentiated according to the context. While oral feedback have been reported to be more beneficial for L1 learners (Biber, Nekrasova, & Horn, 2011), WCF have been found to be favored by L2 learners. For written feedback, Bitchener and Knoch (2010b) showed that L2 writers were able to improve accuracy in a targeted form even after one treatment session of WCF. Sheen's (2010) study on L2 learners also found that improvements were greater when a target form was addressed through written metalinguistic feedback, as opposed to oral feedback.

Aside from the mode of feedback (i.e. oral vs. written) and the approach (i.e. direct vs. indirect; focus vs. unfocused; metalinguistic), another feature pertinent to the systematic provision of feedback is the determination of the type of WCF. It has been suggested that different domains of linguistic knowledge are acquired and managed in different ways (Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005). There is a distinction between 'treatable' and 'untreatable' grammatical errors (Ferris, 1999). Features such as verb tense and form, subject-verb agreement, article usage, plural and possessive noun endings, and sentence fragments are considered treatable errors. On the other hand, forms which are untreatable include errors of word choice and sentence structure. The notion that certain elements are more treatable than others was borne out of studies which have addressed different grammatical and content features pertinent to the writing of L2 learners (Biber, Nekrasova, & Horn, 2011).

Though there are established notions indicating that students who are engaged with their learning processes are more likely to improve, and that the systematic provision of feedback is beneficial, there is very minimal attention dedicated to research contexts where the two are viewed together. According to Rummel and

p40-54 Chen Lili.indd 43 2/8/2560 BE 14:16

Bitchener (2015), there are few studies that specifically explored learners' beliefs toward different types of written CF. They also mentioned that there were fewer studies that explored the impact of learner's beliefs on the effectiveness of WCF. Moreover, as seen in many studies on writing, teachers determined the type of feedback provided, even in situations where classmates were to provide feedback to each other. Identifying these caveats not only allows critical insights to education (Rojo, 2008), but also guides the shaping of pedagogy that is contextually appropriate, especially in contexts where English is used as a foreign language (Hayes, 2009). Hence, the objective of this study is to determine the effects of students' engagement with feedback, seen through their writing quality.

THE STUDY

Context and Sample

The context of this study was an international private University in Thailand, where more than 30 countries were represented. English is the main medium of communication and instruction at this university. The sample involved in this study was from a freshman English composition class, which looked at different types of expository writing. Students enrolled in this class must have passed the University's English entrance exam, or had passed TOEFL or IELTS. These students had an intermediate to advanced proficiency level in writing, and were expected to possess ability to compose academic and non-academic papers. The study was in the opinion that this sample was considered suitable, as most studies in the past had only focused on basic, entry-level students who were still in remedial classes. (see Bitchener 2008, Bitchener & Knoch 2010b). All students in the class were encouraged to participate in the study. The class met for an hour, three times a week. The main components of this class were the development of ideas, learning about the structure of a type of essay, and revising grammatical and structural features pertinent to writing – all of which were done while writing different genres of essay.

Data Form and Collection

The study took on a mixed-methods approach, which included a quasi-experimental and qualitative approach. While the quasi-experimental part dealt with the analysis of the efficacy of WCF, the qualitative segment would analyze the beliefs of the sample towards WCF. The usage of the English article system was chosen as the platform to determine the efficacy of WCF. The study decided to focus on the English article system because studies have reported that focusing on a target form would aid in the overall writing quality of L2 learners. The article system, as explained earlier, belonged to the treatable category of errors. For this, teachers would be able to provide explicit explanation to students (Ferris, 1999). Despite it being relatively easy for teachers to address, the article system is actually a grammatical aspect which is considered challenging for L2 learners to master (Ferris, 2002; Bitchener et al., 2005).

The research procedure began with the researchers explaining to the students the types of feedback that would be employed, which were direct feedback and metalinguistic feedback – all of which would be given in the students' drafts. These two types of feedback were chosen because they were found to be effective means for writing improvement among L2 learners (Sheen, 2010;

p40-54 Chen Lili.indd 44 2/8/2560 BE 14:16

Bitchener & Knoch, 2010b). After the explanation, students were given the opportunity to decide which type of feedback they preferred: direct feedback alone, direct feedback with metalinguistic feedback, or no feedback. This was done as a means to encourage student autonomy, and subsequently better engage students in their writing tasks. Students were then grouped into three groups, according to the type of feedback they believed would help them. These groups were:

1. Direct feedback

2. Direct feedback plus written metalinguistic feedback

3. No feedback (control group)

For this particular study, the intact students of the course had to write a cause-and-effect essay. To facilitate students' writing, a picture prompt was provided. The prompt was considered suitable as it would allow students to describe what was seen in the picture with or without the target grammar form, as well as giving enough space for individual interpretation, which in turn would give the researchers an idea of the L2 writers' range of writing knowledge (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010a). The students were expected to submit three drafts of this writing task. After the submission of each draft, the researchers took about a week to return the draft, accompanied by feedback. The research's feedback could be found in each draft. Since some earlier studies had questioned the effectiveness of continuous revisions (Hyland, 2003), this study took into consideration the accurate use of articles throughout all the drafts.

After the third draft, students' beliefs were collected via a survey with open-ended questions. Responses from the survey and open-ended questions were analyzed and emergent themes were compared with the quantitative data. The survey included three Sections. Section A contained demographic and background questions, such as 'How many years have you been studying English in formal education?' Section B included eight questions, which can be scaled along 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, to 5 = strongly agree. In Section B, questions number 1 to 5 aimed at gaining students' beliefs about WCF, such as 'It is important for teachers must correct students' written errors'. On the other hand, questions number 6 to 8 aimed at getting information about students' attitudes towards WCF, such as 'I always pay close attention to my teacher's written feedback on my writing.' The last section, Section C, was an open-ended question, which aimed to allow students to elaborate their responses for the questions posed in Section B.

FINDINGS

The percentage of accurate usage of the English article system was calculated over three drafts. The first draft was considered the pre-test stage, before WCF was provided. The second and third drafts represented the post-test, and delayed post-test stages. These drafts were considered testing stages as students did other writing tasks in between drafts, such as journal, sentence, and essay writing. Table 1 shows number of subjects per feedback group, and the corresponding descriptive data regarding the accuracy rate of the three stages.

To analyze the differences between group means, a one-way ANOVA was conducted. The test indicated no statistically significant difference between the three groups at the time of the pre-test (P-value=0.3485) (see Table 2). To analyze variance among the three groups, a two-way

p40-54 Chen Lili.indd 45 2/8/2560 BE 14:16

Table 1. Descriptive data of accuracy over three stages or writing

Group	*N*	Pre-test (1st Draft)		Post-test (2nd Draft)		Delayed Post-test (3rd Draft)	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1. Direct Feedback	6	91%	0.04	94%	0.03	97%	0.02
2. Direct Feedback & Metalinguistic Feedback	3	100%	0.00	87%	0.06	90%	0.01
3. Control Group	3	95%	0.05	83%	0.10	88%	0.02

repeated measures ANOVA conducted. Three students of Group 1 (direct feedback treatment group) was randomly assigned as representatives in order to match the Groups 2 and 3. The results of the two-way repeated measures ANOVA is shown in Table 3. Results indicated that there was no significance variance in accuracy improvement rates in the three groups.

After quantitative data was collected from the three drafts, quantitative and qualitative data was collected through a survey which also had open-ended questions. The average scores for students of the survey results are provided in Table 4.

The results in Table 4 bring about at least two points. First, all the subjects, who themselves decided what type of feedback they were to receive throughout the writing process, still firmly believed that the feedback is effective. On top of the positive belief, subjects also had a positive

Table 2. Differences between group means through one-way ANOVA

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	0.016783	2	0.008392	1.187546	0.348573	4.256495
Within Groups	0.063598	9	0.007066			
Total	0.080381					

Table 3. ANOVA-Two factor with replication

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	0.016783	2	0.008392	1.187546	0.348573	4.256495
Within Groups	0.063598	9	0.007066			
Total	0.080381					

Table 4. Mean scores of sample's beliefs, attitudes, and no. of persons who had changes in belief

Group	Beliefs (X)	Attitudes (X)	Changes in Beliefs (n)
1. Direct Feedback	4.63	3.69	1
2. Direct Feedback & Metalinguistic Feedback	4.53	3.56	1
3. Control Group	4.40	3.56	1

p40-54 Chen Lili.indd 46 2/8/2560 BE 14:16

disposition, or attitude, towards the feedback selected. At the end of the study, only one student from each group changed their perception towards the type of feedback they had initially chosen.

DISCUSSION

Systematic Provision of Feedback

Efficacy of Feedback

The quantitative analysis indicated there was no significant improvement across the three groups involved in this study. As seen in other studies, there are treatment groups which did not experience statistically significant improvement. For instance, in Bitchener and Knoch's (2010b) study, the treatment group who received indirect feedback did not show any statistical significant improvement. Another example is Sheen, Wright, and Moldawa's (2009) study, where the subjects who received focused feedback experienced more statistically significant improvement compared to their peers who received unfocused feedback. Though there may not be any statistically significant improvement when considered as a group, general trends in each group do show an increase in accuracy across drafts. For example, in Ellis et al.'s (2008) study, when individual subjects within the treatment group were considered, improvement did become evident, even though group mean scores did not indicate any statistically significant changes. The interpretation of results in Ellis et al.'s (2008) study, which looked at individual student's performance, should perhaps be a cornerstone for the provision of feedback.

When revisiting Table 1, the mean scores for accuracy in each group does appear to increase. Even the control group exhibited gradual improvement, which parallels Sheen's (2007) study. This may be due to the practice that subjects received in performing their written tasks, and not necessarily from the teacher's feedback. Tables 5 to 7 below

Table 5. Direct feedback subjects' accuracy scores across tests/drafts

Subject	Drafts		
	1st	2nd	3rd
1	100%	100%	93.54%
2	80%	93.75%	91.37%
3	100%	94.74%	94.87%
4	81.81%	100%	100%
5	100%	81.25%	100%
6	83.83%	95%	100%

Table 6. Metalinguistic feedback subjects' accuracy scores across tests/draft

Subject	Drafts		
	1st	2nd	3rd
1	100%	83.25%	88.00%
2	100%	100%	88.46%
3	100%	79.16%	92.31%

p40-54 Chen Lili.indd 47 2/8/2560 BE 14:16

Table 7. Control subjects' accuracy scores across tests/drafts

Subject	Drafts		
	1st	2nd	3rd
1	100%	85.16%	89.36%
2	85.71%	65%	84.36%
3	100%	100%	90.90%

shows the individual scores of each subject in the three different groups.

Slight improvement may have occurred because direct feedback has been reported as effective as it has helped identify mistakes and provide immediate corrections. Direct feedback had also been found, in other studies, to help students retain improvement over an extended period of time. These results parallel other similar studies such as that by Sheen, Wright, and Maldowa (2009), Bitchener and Knoch (2010a; b), and Sheen (2010). Moreover, subjects who had received metalinguistic feedback may have gained a better understanding of the errors they made. The performance of the treatment groups corroborate findings from other studies which have investigated the efficacy of the systematic provision of feedback (see Sheen, 2007). Since the English article system is a discrete form that is rule governed, and the feedback given was direct, in that corrections were immediately provided, students who were engaged would have noticed their errors and implemented correct usage in subsequent drafts. That said, there was also an observed improvement trend among students of the control group. In the context of this study, subjects' exposure to the English language was not only confined to the course where data was collected. All the subjects were taking other courses in the English medium. Hence, there may be other confounding variables, beyond the control of the research parameters and researchers, which have affected the subjects' usage of English articles, as well as their writing as a whole.

Engagement with Feedback

A systematic provision of feedback would not necessarily engage learners, as studies where comprehensive feedback was given to students (Van Beuningen, De Jong, & Kuiken, 2012). Students have their part to play as well, and that is to be

Table 8. Summary of students' perception towards corrective feedback

Direct Feedback (Group 1)	Direct + Metalinguistic Feedback (Group 2)	No Feedback (Group 3)
Do not like to read teacher's comments; Helped recognize mistakes in a clear and prompt manner; Feedback is direct; Feedback is not confusing	Teacher's feedback can help me recognize my mistakes; I know where I make mistakes; I know how to correct them	I don't need teacher's feedback

p40-54 Chen Lili.indd 48 2/8/2560 BE 14:16

engaged with stimulus provided by their teachers. Of course, engagement may be influenced by other variables, such as that discussed earlier (see Ferris et al., 2013). The assumption was that if students were engaged, there would be an acquisition and uptake of CF, which would then be incorporated in subsequent writing tasks. Though this may be observed in the improvement seen in Table 1, other aspects other than improvement also need to be considered to better understand the subjects' engagement. The survey distributed after the students' final draft may divulge deeper insights into the worth of the feedback. Table 8 provides a summary of the subjects' perceptions towards the types of treatment they received, obtained from the open-ended questions.

The direct feedback treatment group decided that direct feedback was suitable for them because of its convenience. The major themes in their comments were that direct feedback was provided immediate indication of errors and corresponding corrections. Though studies have shown that direct feedback may be practical, its effects may not be as lasting when compared to direct feedback provided with metalinguistic explanation. As seen in Table 5, the treatment group that received both metalinguistic feedback and direct feedback, on the other hand, mentioned that aside from knowing immediately what the errors and corrections were, they also knew how to correct these errors. The subjects' 'knowing' may have stemmed from the researcher's explanation of the errors and the correct forms. For instance, in Bitchener, Young, and Cameron (2005), subjects were found to make greater improvement in grammatical accuracy when they received explicit direct corrective feedback, complemented by explanation through conference with the teacher. Also seen in Sheen (2007), subjects who received direct focused feedback with metalinguistic feedback showed greater gains in grammatical accuracy of article usage. The effect of combining direct feedback with metalinguistic comments is that students may gain both awareness and understanding. Sheen (2007) further stated that this combination of feedbacks would support the development of analytical skills of high aptitude language learners.

PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

There are several pedagogical implications which we may draw from the findings of this study. One that teachers may consider is the use of a systematic feedback approach, where writing tasks focus only on one or several target forms or structures. A single error becomes salient when the teacher focuses only on that single error. Furthermore, feedback becomes more effective when minimal forms or structures are targeted (Sheen, 2007). This may help students, especially L2 writers, ease the cognitive load expected when writing. Nonetheless, there are studies which had indicated that an 'unsystematic' approach in the provision of feedback is effective as well. Comprehensive provision of feedback has been found to be effective for certain type of writing tasks, as reported by Van Beuningen, De Jong, and Kuiken (2012), where subjects had more durable improvement, as well as an increase in self-correction. Because this type of feedback does not explicitly state the corrections, it needs to be extended across several drafts as writers will need to be able to compare whether their corrections were indeed correct. In another similar study, subjects who were provided indirect feedback

p40-54 Chen Lili.indd 49 2/8/2560 BE 14:16

were found to be more engaged with their writing. The provision of indirect WCF necessitated writers to be more cognitively active, which were pivotal in both uptake and retention of the correct form (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010).

The understanding of a systematic approach, thus, is not only constricted to feedback that focuses only on a pre-selected form or area in writing. The systematic provision of WCF should be interpreted as a critical and reflective process which shapes pedagogical decisions and actions. As proposed by Rojo (2008), a critical approach to pedagogy will not only deepen a teacher's pedagogical epistemology, but it will result in more relevant teaching that will benefit students. This may be likened to what Gholami and Husu's (2010) 'moral ethos', where teachers teach with their students' welfare in mind, as opposed to teaching a certain way out of convenience. Although idealistic, teaching with students' interest prioritized would probably be more beneficial not only for students' learning progress, but also the quality of teacher development. Unfortunately, studies have documented the prevalence of an unsystematic approach in feedback provision. It has been reported in some contexts that WCF was provided without much thought or planning. In a study exploring the how feedback is provided, McMartin-Miller (2014) found that teachers reported a difficulty in being selective in the provision of WCF. Subjects of this study reported responding to errors in a manner that is inconsistent to what had been suggested by studies on WCF. These subjects consider empirical findings as not finite prescriptive determinants of their pedagogy, but mere guidelines. Reflecting upon the results of this study on those from the past, it may be crucial for teachers to consider the purpose and scope of WCF, as well as whether or not the selected WCF is meaningful for their students, and whether it will promote long-term measures that will help students achieve autonomy (Lee, 2003).

Another consideration that can be made is the diversification of sources for feedback. Aside from feedback given by teachers, peer feedback and other writing correction tools may be useful and effective, especially for L2 learners (Paulus, 1999; Biber, Nekrasova, & Horn, 2011). In past studies, L2 writers have disclosed that they had relied on other types of feedback such as grammar books, tutors, or other more proficient students because of challenges faced in understanding teacher's WCF (Ferris, 1995). This brings about another point, which is, WCF that would be appropriate for the development of students' writing quality, but also for the enhancement of their learning skills. Writers who are able to outsource WCF to external sources are demonstrating a form of agency (Ferris, 1995). Though it has been reported that L2 writers also look at external feedback, aside from WCF provided by their teachers, more research needs to be carried out to examine the degree of effectiveness of WCF originating from external sources. For instance, as reported by Stevenson and Phakiti (2014), studies on the effectiveness of automated writing evaluation (AWE) software is still minimal. Another consideration is to assess writing students' grammatical accuracy not only in major writing tasks. Other forms of assessments such as journal entries and tests could also be useful sources of data to determine the efficacy of WCF, as well as students' acquisition of language knowledge by being engaged with teacher's WCF.

p40-54 Chen Lili.indd 50 2/8/2560 BE 14:16

LIMITATION AND FUTURE DIRECTION

There was one major limitation to this study, and several plausible ways to address it. The major issue was, even though data was collected from several drafts, these drafts belonged to one topic. This may not necessarily show whether or not the use of the English article system has been correctly acquired. Perhaps future studies could consider analyzing the use of the target forms in other writing tasks or assignments within the research context or sample. This would give more data sets to help determine whether or not teacher's pedagogical intervention, such as WCF, would have any statistically significant bearing on students' writing performance. Evaluating other sources of data may also reveal more information about students' engagement. When students acquired language knowledge through noticing their errors and their teacher's feedback, they may be able to analyze the use of learned language forms in other tasks. As such, it was suggested that teachers consider evaluating students' performance in analytical tests (Sheen, 2007). Furthermore, since feedback may affect students differently, the assessment of progress should perhaps be confined to the individual subjects, instead of comparing the range of scores by all subjects (Ellis et al., 2008; Loo, 2015).

CONCLUSION

As seen in this study, involving students in the feedback process may be fruitful. Not only will students understand the type of feedback given, they will also learn how to respond to the feedback. When considering students' preferences, perhaps teachers should also take into account students' individualities. Studies have highlighted with individual differences, the preferences for feedback, as well as the beliefs pertaining the efficacy of feedback by differ (Ferris et al., 2013). Hyland (2003) actually proposed that feedback should resonate with students' own beliefs. By involving students in the feedback process, teachers, especially in ELF settings may achieve teaching professionalism proposed by Hayes (2009), whereby teaching takes into consideration the sociocultural and educational background of the students and learning context. When these are addressed, perhaps a real improvement may be seen in the writing quality of L2 learners.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researchers would like to thank Mrs. Wilma Lee, who had allowed the researchers to work with her and her students in their English composition class.

AUTHORS' BIOGRAPHIES

Chen Lili is a TESOL graduate from Asia-Pacific International University.

Daron Benjamin Loo is an instructor at the Centre for English Language Communication, National University of Singapore. His research interest includes feedback provision and teacher development.

Helen Tajoda is a lecturer at the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Asia-Pacific International University. Her research interest is in curriculum development and management.

p40-54 Chen Lili.indd 51 2/8/2560 BE 14:16

REFERENCES

Barcelos, A. M. F. (2003). Researching beliefs about SLA: A critical review. In A. Barcelos & P. Kalaja (Eds.), **Beliefs about SLA: New research approaches** (pp. 7-33). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Biber, D., Nekrasova, T., & Horn, B. (2011). The Effectiveness of Feedback for L1 English and L2 Writing Development: A Meta Analysis. **ETS Research Report Series,** 2011(1), i-99. doi: 10.1002/j.2333-8504.2011.tb02241.x

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010b). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. **Journal of Second Language Writing,** 19, 207-217. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2010.10.002

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. **Journal of Second Language Writing,** 17(2), 102-118. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010a). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten month investigation. **Applied Linguistics,** 31(2), 193-214. doi: 10.1093/applin/amp016

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. **Journal of Second Language Writing,** 14(3), 191-205. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001

Ehrman, M. E., Leaver, B. L., & Oxford, R. L. (2003). **A brief overview of individual differences in second language learning.** System, 31(3), 313-330. doi: 10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00045-9

Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). **The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context.** System, 36(3), 353-371. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2008.02.001

Ferris, D. R. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes. A response to Truscott (1996). **Journal of Second Language Writing,** 8, 1-10. doi: 10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80110-6

Ferris, D. R. (2002). **Treatment of error in second language student writing.** Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D. R. (2004). The ‘‘Grammar Correction’’ debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime. . .?). **Journal of Second Language Writing,** 13, 49-62. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.005

Ferris, D. R., Liu, H., Sinha, A., & Senna, M. (2013). Written corrective feedback for individual L2 writers. **Journal of Second Language Writing,** 22(3), 307-329. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.009

Ferris, D.R. (1995). Students’ reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition Classrooms. **TESOL Quarterly,** 29, 33-53. doi: 10.2307/3587804

Gholami, K., & Husu, J. (2010). How do teachers reason about their practice? Representing the epistemic nature of teachers’ practical knowledge. **Teaching and Teacher Education,** 26(8), 1520-1529. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2010.06.001

Grami, M. (2005). The effect of teachers’ written feedback on ESL students’ perception: A study in a Saudi ESL university-level context. **Annual Review of Education, Communication and Language Sciences, 2.**

p40-54 Chen Lili.indd 52 2/8/2560 BE 14:16

Hartshorn, K. J., Evans, N. W., Merrill, P. F., Sudweeks, R. R., Strong-Krause, Diane, & Anderson, N. J. (2010). Effects of dynamic corrective feedback on ESL writing accuracy. **TESOL Quarterly, 44(1),** 84-109. doi: 10.5054/tq.2010.213781

Hayes, D. (2009). Learning Language, Learning Teaching Episodes from the Life of a Teacher of English in Thailand. **RELC Journal, 40(1),** 83-101. doi: 10.1177/0033688208101446

Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: **Student engagement with teacher feedback.** System, 31(2), 217-230. doi: 10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00021-6

Jang, H., Reeve, J., & Deci, E. L. (2010). Engaging students in learning activities: It is not autonomy support or structure but autonomy support and structure. **Journal of Educational Psychology,** 102(3), 588. doi: 10.1037/a0019682

Lee, I. (2003). L2 writing teachers' perspectives, practices and problems regarding error feedback. **Assessing Writing, 8(3),** 216-237. doi: 10.1016/j.asw.2003.08.002

Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. **Foreign Language Annals, 24,** 203-218. doi: 10.1111/j.1944-9720.1991.tb00464.x

Loo, D. B. (2015) Problematising unfocused written feedback: A case study on four university students' essays. **Issues in Language Studies, 4**(1), 63-74.

McMartin-Miller, C. (2014). How much feedback is enough?: Instructor practices and student attitudes toward error treatment in second language writing. **Assessing Writing, 19, 24-35.** doi: 10.1016/j.asw.2013.11.003

Nassaji, H., & Swain, M. (2000). A Vygotskian perspective on corrective feedback in L2: The effect of random versus negotiated help on the learning of English articles. **Language awareness, 9**(1), 34-51. doi: 10.1080/09658410008667135

Paulus, T. M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. **Journal of second language writing, 8**(3), 265-289. doi: 10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80117-9

Rojo, L. M. (2008). Imposing and resisting ethnic categorization in multicultural classrooms. In R. Dolon & J. Todoli (Eds.), **Analysing Identities in Discourse** (pp. 31-56). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Rummel, S., & Bitchener, J. (2015). The effectiveness of written corrective feedback and the impact Lao learners' beliefs have on uptake. **Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 38**(1), 66-84.

Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. **TESOL Quarterly, 41**(2), 255-283. doi: 10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00059.x

Sheen, Y. (2010). Differential effects of oral and written corrective feedback in the ESL classroom. **Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32**(02), 203-234. doi: 10.1017/S0272263109990507

Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. **System, 37**(4), 556-569. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2009.09.002

Stevenson, M., & Phakiti, A. (2014). The effects of computer-generated feedback on the quality of writing. **Assessing Writing,** 19, 51-65. doi: 10.1016/j.asw.2013.11.007

p40-54 Chen Lili.indd 53 2/8/2560 BE 14:16

Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2010). Learners' processing, uptake, and retention of corrective feedback on writing. **Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32**(02), 303-334. doi: 10.1017/S0272263109990532

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. **Language Learning,** 46, 327–369. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x

Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing. **Language Learning, 62**(1), 1-41. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00674.x

Yang, J. S., & Kim, T. Y. (2011). Sociocultural analysis of second language learner beliefs: A qualitative case study of two study-abroad ESL learners. **System, 39**(3), 325-334. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2011.07.005

p40-54 Chen Lili.indd 54 2/8/2560 BE 14:16